UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,043 12/05/2003		Scott Goldthwaite	WS-104	9327
27769 AKC PATENT	7590 09/03/200 S		EXAMINER	
215 GROVE ST			VYAS, ABHISHEK	
NEWTON, MA 02466			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/729,043	GOLDTHWAITE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	ABHISHEK VYAS	3691	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a final rejection of the	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all			
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will		_
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Alexander Kalinowski/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments set forth by the applicant are unpersuasive. The claims as presented do not place the application in condition for allowance for the following reasons: The claims suggest or make optional but do not require the steps of a merchant server, payment server, an authentication server and a communication device, as they recite optional language such as "adapted to" which raise the question of whether the steps are positively claimed. B. Applicant contends that claims 1 and 23 were not addressed in either office action. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 1 and 23 were addressed on page 2 of the non-final office action and cited again in the final office action. Therefore the final office action stands. It is also pointed out that the communication device is rejected and cited in the non-final office action contrary to the assertion that there is no citation (please refer to non-final office action page 3). The examiner is merely pointing out that the Jacobson reference when broadly interpreted does include a method of reading payment card information via a magnetic stripe reader. Examiner would like to mention that the Gobburu, Young, Jacobson and Kelly references disclose wireless devices and payment authentication systems, therefore employing KSR rationales, it would have been obvious to try various combinations to acquire a desired result. Thus, buying digital goods instead of physical goods as contended by the application would have been obvious to try, further the nature of the goods (whether physical or digital) is non-fuctional descriptive material. In points C-H, it is again contended that limitations are not taught by the combination of references cited, however, the examiner would like to point that since the claim language make optional and do not positively require the steps recited in the claims and limitations argued, due to the recitation of "adapted to", the examiner using the broadest reasonable interpretation, is respectfully unpersuaded and maintains the final rejection. Therefore at this time the request for allowance is respectfully declined.